

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Figures 16A-I, labeled as “PRIOR ART”.

Attachment: 1 Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Preliminary Matters:

Dealing with preliminary matters first, Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim to priority and receipt of the priority document. Further, it is noted with appreciation that the Examiner has considered the Information Disclosure Statement filed concurrently with the application.

Drawings:

The Examiner has objected to the drawings. Specifically, the Examiner has objected to Figures 16A to 16I as not being labeled "PRIOR ART". Applicants submit Figures 16A-16I, so labeled.

Specification:

The Examiner objects to the specification because of informalities. Specifically, the Examiner cites to page 5, line 8, the phrase "18D", should read --16D--. Further, the Examiner also cites page 7, line 22, the phrase "Figs. 16A" should read --Figs. 16A to 16I--. Applicants have so amended the specification.

Title:

The Examiner has objected to the title for not being descriptive. Applicants thank the Examiner for suggesting the title as "METHOD OF MANUFACTURING A RETAINER FOR A ROLLER BEARING". Applicants have so-amended the title.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson (U.S. Patent No. 3,240,543) in view of Fernstrom (U.S. Patent No. 1,602,350). Further, claim 4

is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson in view of Fernstrom as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pottiez (DE 4 140 161 a1). Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 3 without prejudice. For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Applicant believes that the examiner misunderstands Benson.

In detail, the Examiner asserts that the step of "plastically deforming a portion of the second intermediate material excluding a radially outer end portion thereof into a tubular shape" is disclosed as a crown portion 22 with sloping portions 23 and 24, as shown in Fig. 10 of Benson. However, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fig. 10 of Benson is a sectional view taken along line 10-10 of Fig. 9. A bottomed portion 22 is formed by embossing an intermediate portion between an inner circumference and an outer circumference of ring 29. That is, in the step of Figs. 9 & 10, the entirety of the second intermediate material is not deformed into a tubular shape. Rather, the reference specifically states:

The blank 29 with the openings 32 formed therein is then further shaped by raising the central portions of the bars 18 which extend between each pair of openings 32.

Col. 3, lines 69-71

As such, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Benson in this respect.

Further, in claim 1 it is defined that a portion excluding a radially outer end portion of the second intermediate material is deformed. Thus, a part of the second intermediate material other than this portion should be deformed. However, in Benson, an inner circumference of the second intermediate material 29 is not deformed. See also, claim 14.

Finally, claim 1 recites:

wherein portions which are each present between a central hole of the second intermediate material and each of the through holes are each formed in an arch shape in which a respective intermediate portion projects in a radial direction of the second intermediate material relative to both end portions, and
the arch-like portion is extended when the portion of the second intermediate material excluding the radially outer end portion thereof is plastically deformed into the tubular shape

The “respective intermediate portions” correspond to, for example, element 30 in the drawings of the subject application. It is clear that Benson does not teach or suggest this aspect of the invention either.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

In addition, new claim 13 recites that the inner circumferences includes a wave shape, which is clearly not taught or suggested by the prior art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian Hannon/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 9, 2009

Brian W. Hannon
Registration No. 32,778